DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 743 CS 206 207

AUTHOR Lally, Tim D. P., Ed.
TITLE Journal of Advanced Composition, Volume 1, Number 1.
INSTITUTION Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 36p.
JOURNAL CIT Journal of Advanced Composition; v1 n1 Spr 1980

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College English; Course Descriptions; English Curriculum; Higher Education; Teaching Methods; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction; Writing Research; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Advanced Composition

ABSTRACT

The seven articles in this journal issue focus on the teaching of writing beyond the required college freshman composition courses. The articles provide the following: (1) a discussion of ways to teach transferable and local writing skills, (2) arguments for and against the use of tape-recorded comments rather than written comments to respond to students' compositions, (3) theoretical speculations on the advanced composition curriculum, (4) a discussion of writing about writing in an advanced composition course, (5) an argument for courses for the preprofessional within a liberal arts curriculum, and (6) a survey of advanced composition course offerings in colleges and universities across the United States. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Tim D.P. Lally
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED199743

CS206207

Volume 1, Number 1 Inaugural Issue Spring 1980

THE JOURNAL OF ADVANCED COMPOSITION is published twice a year by the Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition (ATAC).

ATAC Officers:

President: Michael P. Hogan, Southeast Missouri State University
Vice President: Rita Sturm, University of Albuquerque
Secretary-Treasurer: Bernice W. White, Southwestern at Memphis
Secretary: Karen Pelz, Dartmouth College
Program Director: Mary McGann, Ohio State University
Editor: Tim D. P. Lally, Bowling Green State University

Editorial Board:

Harold Branam, Pikeville College
Richard M. Coe, University of British Columbia
Julie Dietche, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point
Richard Fulkerson, East Texas State University
Jeanne W. Halpern, Purdue University
Karen Jambeck, University of Connecticut
Ulle W. Lewes, Ohio Wesleyan University
Alex Medlicott, Jr., University of Connecticut
Karen Pelz, Dartmouth College
Amy K. Richards, Wayne State University
William B. Stone, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Michael Stugrin, University of Pittsburgh
Rita Sturm, University of Albuquerque

CORRESPONDENCE concerning the ATAC should be sent to Michael Hogan, Dept. of English, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701.

MEMBERSHIP DUES should be sent to Bernice W. White, Dept. of English, Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis, TN 38112.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO JAC should be sent to Tim Lally, Dept. of English, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403; AFTER JULY 1, 1980 to Tim Lally, Dept. of English, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL 36688. See inside back cover for further information for contributors.

Copyright (c) 1980 by the Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition. All rights reserved. Ownership of copyright will be returned to contributors upon request.

The editor thanks Professor Lester Barber, Chair of English of Bowling Green State University for administrative support.

Transferable and Local Writing Skills

W. Ross Winterowd

One indication of the state of our profession[1] is the discriminations that we are just getting around to making: useful, even essential, "sortings out" that, when they are made, seem embarrassingly obvious. One such "sorting out" or discrimination is essential for an understanding of what any composition class can do, whether advanced composition, technical writing, feature writing, or whatever.

In the writer's repertoire, there are *local* and *transferable* skills. Local skills have to do with a given genre and involve such matters as special forms (e.g., the scientific report), footnoting, vocabularies, special styles, and even the "tones" that particular fields demand. Transferable skills are the "basics" of writing: syntactic fluency, control of diction, sense of audience, organizational ability, "mechanics" such as punctuation and spelling.

A given class may attempt to confer both local and transferable skills on students (e.g., a course in technical writing); furthermore, the distinction between the kinds of skills becomes blurred at the middle of the spectrum. Nonetheless, it is crucial that composition teachers keep the distinction in mind.

According to my colleague and friend Stephen D. Krashen, there are two kinds of language Learning (note the capital *L*): *acquisition* and *learning* (note the lower case *l*).[2] The overwhelming bulk of anyone's knowledge of language is *acquired*, that is, is learned in generally the same way that a child learns his or her native language: by hearing it, by attempting to use it, and by receiving feedback concerning semantic intention, not the form of the utterance. The child "swims" in a sea of language and mentally absorbs it because he or she is destined biologically to talk; the child makes attempts to communicate in an unfinished version of this language; the parent responds *not* to the imperfections of form, but to the child's apparent intention. Gradually, the child acquires a virtually total knowledge of the language, but this knowledge is *tacit* (to use Polanyi's term): roughly speaking, tacit knowledge is knowledge that paradoxically we do not know we know. For example, anyone and everyone can make a promise, but almost no one can state the set of constitutive rules for promising, even though these rules are explicitly formulable, as John Searle demonstrates.[3] Our knowledge of the rules for promising is tacit knowledge.

However, we can consciously *learn* some language skills, through rules and paradigms. For example, we can consciously memorize a spelling rule and apply it: *i* before *e* except after *c*. If we are trying to learn German, we can memorize a paradigm for the definite article: Masc.: *der, des, dem, den;* Fem.: *die, der, der, die;* Neut.: *das, des, dem, das;* Pl.: *die, der, den, die.* It should be stressed, however, that we can learn only a very small part of what we need to use a language fluently. The vast part of our knowledge is acquired.

With Krashen, my colleague Betty Bamber, and others, I believe that the learning-acquisition theory applies to writing, as well as to the first language Learning, second language Learning, and second dialect Learning. If this assumption is valid-- and we have good reason to believe that it is[4]-- then teachers of composition need to review their programs and methods in light of the theory.

Almost all of the *transferable* skills must, by and large, be *acquired*. Prewriting, writing, reformulation-- these processes are acquired through models

(hence the importance of the proper kinds of reading); though making attempts at writing; through teacher intervention in the writing process; and through massive, intelligent feedback. (I do not want to oversimplify. In the effective composition class, the student is both learning and acquiring, but acquisition outweights learning enormously.) The set of skills that can be learned-- if they have not been acquired--are those of editing: punctuation, verb agreement, pronoun reference, and so on. As I have argued at length elsewhere,[1] this concept leads to the establishment of two Learning scenes: a writing workshop, where acquisition takes place, and a laboratory, where editing skills are learned.

It seems equally obvious to me that local skills can be--and usually are--learned, though they also can be--and sometimes are--acquired. If this is the case, then a reasonable form for an advanced composition program begins to emerge.

In the first place, advanced composition students must have a relatively complete mastery of editing skills. Remediation in the mechanics of punctuation, verb agreement, and spelling have no place whatsoever in an advanced composition program.

Second, advanced composition students must have acquired a relatively high degree of ability with all of the transferable skills. (Institutions must determine their own criteria for defining "relatively high degree of ability.") The acquired skills are at the heart of writing ability, and there is no upper limit to their refinement, just as there is no upper limit to the development of skills in any of the other arts.

Third, local skills can be either integrated into the program on the basis of individual student need or as specialized classes in advanced composition.

An example will explain the last paragraph. The ability to write funding proposals for various agencies, governmental and private, depends very largely on learning a set of local skills which are more or less clearly defined according to the agency at which the proposal is aimed. It is quite likely that a significant number of students--who have acquired a relatively high degree of writing skills--could benefit greatly from learning to write proposals. To accommodate these students, there are two possibilities. An advanced composition class could emphasize proposal writing and could even use the term "proposal" in its title. Alternatively, "units" on proposal writing could be developed for the laboratory so that students and faculty could learn the skills of proposal writing when the need arose.

In fact, the laboratory should contain many such units: research writing, writing for the social sciences, writing business letters, report writing, and so on.

This concept brings us squarely into "writing across the curriculum," for clearly a sociologist can define the skills of sociological writing better than, say, a humanist. Therefore, the sociologist and the writing instructor working together can construct units through which students can learn the skills necessary to make writing acceptable in the social sciences.

Conversely, social scientists can learn how to "teach" writing classes in which students sharpen their acquired skills. Perhaps with undue optimism, I have claimed on several occasions that a literate, interested, and willing faculty member from any discipline can be trained as an effective writing teacher within a very short time, perhaps two weeks, and in another place I will outline the nature of that training. In fact, I have begun in-service training projects that seem to bear out my view.

One of the main problems with advanced composition is defining its goals. Is *advanced composition*, in fact, a euphemism for *advanced remedial writing*, or does the term imply the learning of specific forms such as that of the scientific report?

I suppose the advanced composition course that I would like to teach would be somewhat ill defined; it would be simply a course in writing--not in the composition of literary analysis or technical reports or personal essays, but in writing as writing, writing as an art. That is, I would not be so concerned with what the students wrote as with the quality of their writing, and, of course, there is a qualitative difference among, for instance, scientific reports as there is among representatives of all genres. The qualitative difference almost never comes about from learned skills, but from partially *acquired* skills, skills that students have not mastered or sharpened. As an adjunct to the course, I would, needless to say, have a well run lab, in which students could learn the forms that they needed for their writing, the local skills.

The key to all of this is an understanding of how people Learn to write. Until we pay attention to *that*, we will flounder and be more or less unproductive in our efforts.

Which brings me to my final, and polemic, statement. It is always a disaster if a faculty pays attention only to the teaching of writing, the designing of curricula, and so on. We need to ask the basic questions and to proceed on the basis of our knowledge. There is, after all, nothing quite so practical as good theory which we can test, either "scientifically" or in the laboratory of our own experience as teachers.

University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

NOTES

1. By "our profession," I mean the study of literacy and the teaching of reading and writing, and I include creative writing and all literary studies.
2. "On the Acquisition of Planned Discourse: Written English as a Second Dialect," Claremont Reading Conference/1978.
3. Speech Acts (Cambridge, Engl.: Cambridge University, 1969).
4. For three yeaps, I have been working with the Huntington Beach Union High School District, and though we have no published studies, our experience indicates that the assumptions are valid and productive.
5. "Developing a Composition Program," Proceeedings of the 1979 Meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English (Akron: University of Akron, forthcoming).

Cassette Commentary: An Approach to the Teaching of Expository Writing

Alexander Medlicott, Jr.

It is generally acknowledged by most teachers of literature and composition that this generation of college students either doesn't, can't, or won't read. They're more attuned to electronic visual images and the spoken word. They look and they listen. They don't devour books with the same relish that their brothers and sisters did a generation ago.

It was with this state of affairs in mind that I recently tried to figure out some method of "speaking" to my composition students about their work, without the exhausting ordeal of extensive written comments on their essays-- some method that was unique, that appealed to them, and that was ultimately a valuable learning experience. I found a method. It employs a tape recorder and cassettes. I'll explain how it works shortly.

I meet my composition students in the classroom only once or twice a week for about 50 minutes per session. This time is spent teaching such traditional compositional techniques as inductive and deductive reasoning, theme development, organization, sentence and paragraph transitions, and argumentation. In addition to the *whole* essay, I drill on things like sentence style and variety, punctuation, basic grammar, diction, and proofreading techniques. A good deal of effort is spent on the analysis of student papers. I ditto or Xerox a group of essays from the class-- essays that are patently bad or remarkably readable-- and turn the students loose on them. As most of us know, students tend to be far better critics of their peers' work than they are of their own. Thus, seeing their friends' flaws gives them confidence in their own abilities and teaches them a good deal about style, tone, organization, and syntax.

I might add here that the battle between tutorial versus classroom instruction in writing has raged for years.[1] I have had a few great moments in large lecture classes, but after a quarter of a century teaching composition I've found that the tutorial system works best *for me*. Personally, I like the one-on-one method. I find my students less intimidated by their peers-- and me-- in the relative privacy of my office. Showing, rather than telling, is an effective teaching tool. And the immediacy of an on-the-spot revision of a problematical clause, sentence, or paragraph seems more productive for *my students* than my marginal comments and lengthy preces which the students digest, or attempt to digest, without the benefit of my explanations and graphic examples.

Classroom discussion and the usual give-and-take battles over student essays, however, are the end result of my idea about "getting to" my composition class. My idea exploits this generation's ability (or propensity) to listen rather than to read. My system works this way. Twenty-four hours (48 is preferable) before a student comes to my office for a regularly-scheduled conference, he hands in an essay on a topic I have assigned at the beginning of the week. The assignments are very specific and touch on the problems in composition that plague every generation of writing students. Incidentally, a week's class is devoted to one kind of essay or only to one specific compositional problem. I then read the essay carefuly, marking the obvious flaws in grammar, syntax, spelling, and the like. Then I tape on a cassette an extensive comment about the paper. Almost everyone

on this campus either owns a tape recorder or has access to one. My comments are directed primarily to content rather than form. That is, I speak about the development of ideas, transitions, supportive evidence, style, tone, and reader interest. Issues of form (the mechanics of composition) are visually apparent to the student in the editing I do before the student and I go over the paper together in conference, and thus need little verbalization on my part. The paper and the cassette comment are left in a prearranged spot for the student to pick up and listen to *before* coming to conference.

By conference time, then, the student has (a) *seen* his essay and made note of its mechanical flaws and strengths, and (b) has *heard* my detailed comments on the general quality of the paper's content. The cassette, of course, becomes the student's permanent record-- a pocket-sized repository of his strengths and weaknesses, as well as a permanent and continuing record of his semester's progress. I have a recorder in my office so that the student and I can listen to my comments whenever needed. Many students, I've found, take notes on the remarks I've recorded so we can review plaguy issues during the conference.

A typical comment might contain remarks like these: "In paragraph two, Joe, you've failed to develop the thesis statement fully. And there's a choppy transition between your introduction (which reads quite well, by the way) and the body of your essay." Or, "Your second example on page three, Anne, is neither pertinent to your argument or very convincing. Why don't you consider using the Three Mile Island incident as evidence to support the statements you've made in the third and fourth paragraphs on the previous page?" Or, "Look at page four, Tom. Notice how the paragraphs there seem to float in space? They're not lashed down to anything. Remember what we did in class last Monday about the business of transitions? Try using something simple like 'in the second place' or 'moreover' to get through that rough area of the papers."

Not only does my taped comment provide a student with a long and detailed note on his paper (far longer than the examples cited above) and provide a kind of intimate commentary on his essay, but taping lifts the burden from the instructor as well. Long *written* evaluations (precis) take time. And they are often casually read, unappreciated, or discarded. It's a good deal easier to *talk* about a paper, especially if the writing course is large and is being taught largely on a personal conference or tutorial basis. Moreover, the conversational tone of an instructor's comments tends to elicit more response from the students. Without catering wholeheartedly to their lust for the spoken word, I provide them with verbal reinforcement-- something which many of them sorely need at one stage or another of their college writing careers. The cost of two or three cassettes (each student buys his own-- a few hours' worth) is, proverbially, money well spent.

Others before me have tried the cassette approach to teaching composition. Prof. Enno Klammer's "Cassettes in the Classroom" lists some of the approaches I've tried in my courses.[3] His complaints that cassette correcting can be "cumbersome" and "time-consuming" are well taken.[3] His concern about the "difficulty [of] dictating into a mike"[4] is mine as well. In the half decade since Professor Klammer's essay, however, modern technology has turned the once bulky tape recorder into a lightweight and practically foolproof device. No longer do I find that carrying a pocket-sized recorder is a burden, nor do I find that my time is chewed up by cassettes any more than it was when I edited and then typed out long critiques of a student's essay. And dictating is really little more intimidating than lecturing. Actually, the conversational tone I try to maintain in

all my cassette comments is intended to show--to tell-- my students that some of the strategies of the spoken word are things they ought to consider in their own writing. Prof. Klammer and I do agree, though, on the major bugaboo of all writing instructors: there is no easy and speedy way to correct, edit, and evaluate student writing. That is, there is no speedy way *if* the job is to be done precisely and well.

Now this scheme of mine might appear to lend itself more comfortably to elementary composition-- to a kind of first year writing program at the college level. But I've discovered that what works well for the talented writers works equally well for those who have not leaped the barrier between rudimentary composition and the more precise and specialized challenges of advanced composition. What I mean by advanced composition, however, is not really the premise of this essay. Suffice it to say that in too many cases, I find my advanced composition students need a great deal of compositional refreshing before I can consider them ready for the hurdles of more sophisticated writing. The only way I know of weeding out the beginners from those who have some talent is to demand-- prior to the start of the semester-- samples of their work. By careful pruning I can then find a workable number of serious writers who do not need work in such basic areas as sentence structure and transitions, paragraphing, thesis control, focus, and the framing of a distinctive style.

Like all schemes to improve the quality of what we do in teaching composition, and to keep vital a difficult art, my taping system requires constant refinement and modification. But I've discovered that the spoken word-- especially to a generation of orally-oriented young men and women-- is a far more efficient and personalized approach to the teaching of composition than is the written commentary so often seen in classes of both elementary and advanced writing. Finally, my scheme carries the tang of newness. All of us who labor in the compositional vineyards can stand a bit of that.

University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

NOTES

1. Judith Budz and Terry Graber, "Tutorial versus Classroom in Freshman English," CE, 37 (1976), 654-656.
2. Enno Klammer, "Cassettes in the Classroom," CE, 35 (1973), 179-181.
3. Ibid., 180.
4. Ibid.

A Reply to Medlicott: Evaluating Writing

Karen Pelz

Professor Medlicott's article "Cassette Commentary: An Approach to the Teaching of Expository Writing" contains several ideas I would like to take issue with and, more importantly perhaps, prompts me to present my own theory of evaluating advanced writing.

The fact may be that this generation of college students is "more attuned to electronic visual images and the spoken word" than the generations which preceded it, but I am not sure that our response should be to encourage this lack of familiarity with the written word. In fact, it may well be students' alienation from written words and writing that has contributed to the decline in verbal skills that classroom teachers have witnessed in the past decade. Perhaps one reason this is true is that students have received the message that few people care about language any more. We need to correct that misconception. In both our written assignments and our written comments on student papers, teachers of writing, especially advanced writing, can provide models as lovers of language for students to follow. Professor Medlicott's statement that the conversational tone of his recorded comments "is intended to show--to tell--my students that some of the strategies of the spoken word are things they ought to consider in their own writing" seems to me to be a delusion. He has just made the point that students do not make this language transfer from other media--from television or film or radio; why, then, does he assume such patterning will derive from his spoken comments on a tape recording?

More important than the use of cassettes versus written comments, however, are two other concepts about evaluating writing that surface in the paper. The first is Professor Medlicott's use of student papers to teach writing. He uses, he says, "essays that are patently bad or remarkably readable." I am sure the students catch on to this dichotomous scheme very quickly and can perceive whether the essay under consideration is "patently bad" or "remarkably readable." Rather than teaching them to form their own judgments about the quality of writing, this process is more likely to teach them how to guess whether any given paper is a good or a bad paper and then say things that will reinforce the instructor's evaluation. Although he does reproduce for discussion some good papers, the emphasis in Professor Medlicott's system is essentially negative; the focus in his directives to the students is to lead them to "seeing their friends' flaws." This process is not likely to foster a true workshop attitude of cooperation among a group of writers sharing an experience that will help them improve their writing. What is important, especially in an advanced writing class where the students can be presumed to have some knowledge about and sophistication in the use of language, is a writers' workshop in which all students have a chance to receive feedback from their peers. This way the students develop critical skills in evaluating writing other than their own, learn to give and receive both positive and negative criticism, and learn valuable copy-editing skills in the process.

Professor Medlicott's essentially negative approach to the evaluation of writing is also reflected in the kinds of comments he makes on student papers. According to him, the comments on the tape "are directed primarily to content rather than form." What is marked on the paper--the only writing by the instructor that the student sees--are "the obvious flaws in grammar, syntax, spelling, and the like,"

ie. negative comments. In addition, in the taped comments cited in the article, all the remarks on what Professor Medlicott refers to as "the general quality of the paper's content" are again negative: Joe has failed to develop a thesis statement fully, Anne's example is not pertinent or convincing, Tom's paragraphs seem to float in space. Thus the verbal reinforcement provided by the instructor, whether in written or spoken form, is almost entirely negative. Quite apart from the whole issue of recorded comments versus written evaluation are the more serious underlying assumptions about how writing should be evaluated.

What is it that we value about writing beyond the freshman level, and how do we go about communicating these values to our students? If we think about the professional writing that we have read and found valuable, there are several qualities that come to mind. The first quality almost certainly will be that the piece of writing said something to us that we thought was important, and second, that it conveyed a sense of its significance to us through the personal commitment in the voice of the writer. Thus we value in writing not just what is said but the manner in which it is said. Manner has to do, of course, with such mundane matters as grammar, mechanics, and sentence structure, but equally important are the somewhat less easily defined qualities of tone and style. We need to let our students know that we value not just the bare minimum of competent expression but the development of their own personal style, a style that will touch and move the reader with its sense of conviction, its integrity, its honesty.

In order to develop a personal style, students in our advanced writing courses are going to have to take risks, and I think we want to show them in our comments and in our own personal writing style that we value risk-taking. It requires a certain amount of courage to depart from the formulaic five-paragraph essay or its variants that have probably served our students well enough in most of their academic courses, but they will never write really well unless they are willing to let go of the merely serviceable and take risks with form and style in their writing. If we value originality--and I hope that we do--then we have to encourage our writing students to stray from the straight and very narrow path of formulaic academic prose and experiment with a more spacious style. One of the ways we can do this, and at the same time encourage them to explore more difficult and complex ideas, is to welcome their attempts at writing in progress, to be willing to look at drafts of papers, not just final products. This way we can help them sort out their ideas, suggest forms that grow organically from content, encourage their attempts to play with language, and give them some positive reinforcement for the risks they are taking in their writing.

Writing is a way of knowing, a way of learning. This is as true for instructors of writing as it is for students. It is too easy for us to be casual when we talk our thoughts about a student's paper into a tape recorder. If we are forced to consider our words, to put our own thoughts into writing, we are likely to be more careful about what we say. If we are to encourage our students to develop the qualities of good writing that I have mentioned, then rather than "giving in" to the media-orientation of our students, we should try to cultivate in them, by our own example, a love of language and respect for the written word.

Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Some Theoretical Speculations on the Advanced Composition Curriculum

Richard Fulkerson

Recently in *CCC* ("Four Philosophies of Composition," 30 [1979], 343-348) I argued that the four-part perspective which M.H. Abrams brought to literary studies in *The Mirror and the Lamp* can be used to highlight a similar structure underlying composition and its teaching. Studying the history of literary theory, Abrams noted that at various times one of the four elements in any artistic transaction (artist, audience, work, universe) dominated, and the dominance created a coherent perspective about what literature was for, how it should be produced, and when it was successful.

Changing Abram's terminology somewhat, I asserted that much controversy within the discipline of composition is clarified if one accepts the existence of a parallel group of four discourse theories-- theories often held unconsciously and sometimes even contradictorily. The following table makes the terminology clear:

Element Emphasized	*Literary Theory*	*Discourse Theory*
Writer	[*Abrams*]	Expressive
Reader	Expressive	Rhetorical
Text	Pragmatic	Formalist
Universe	Objective Mimetic	Mimetic

These are four theories of discourse, that is, of what discourse as a whole is for and therefore of how it is to be judged, not (I want to emphasize) four types of discourse. Pieces of writing can not usefully be classified according to this scheme, and single pieces of writing can usefully be examined from several perspectives. But most of us tend to see and judge *all* discourse primarily from one of these perspectives. Doing so without being aware of alternate theories causes both confusion and frustration.

In three ways Abrams's model might apply directly to advanced composition. First, as a friend of mine is fond of saying, "The model has curricular implications." Freshman composition is either a survey of composition or a simplified practical course for everyone; but advanced composition, like advanced work in any discipline, allows for increased selectivity and specialization. Hence, at the advanced level, we might offer a variety of more probing composition courses, perhaps one based on each of the four theories of discourse. Students could then be required to take certain courses or allowed to select the one or ones best fitted to their personal or professional needs.

We would thus have (at least) one course in Advanced Self-Expression. Professional writing especially reflecting an expressive theory, such as the essays of James Baldwin, George Orwell, and Joan Didion could be studied as models. Techniques of self-discovery at the prewriting stage would also be emphasized; free writing and journals would be crucial, and writing would be judged for such qualities as depth of insight, honesty, and openness. Since such writing is not primarily done for readers, reader-effectiveness might be regarded as unimportant, as would most matters of form. So-called "creative" writing would be appropriate, but not demanded.

We would have yet another course in which audience analysis and adaptation

was crucial, Advanced Rhetoric. Here students would study theories of persuasion and methods of appealing to various audiences, including probably the findings of Madison Avenue. As models they might examine instances of conspicuously successful persuasion in public politics. They might even study the effective use of fallacies and doublespeak. Their writing would probably be submitted to some real audience for evaluative response as well as to mock audiences composed of students in class.

And we could have one or more advanced composition courses emphasizing form. Students might well learn to write specified sentence patterns, such as cumulative sentences, or the curt style, or colloquial versus formal styles. Close imitation might be a major activity. Or perhaps only one manuscript form judged crucial for these students would be emphasized, such as laboratory report form, or technical proposal form, or grant writing form, or letter writing form. The goal of the course and the measure of student success would be mastery of the form or forms emphasized. We already have a few courses in this category: some courses in the form of business writing and some in the forms of fiction or drama. Many departments also have an advanced course in grammatical form, but it is not usually a composition course at all. And I teach a course in advanced composition for pre-law students which emphasizes certain forms of reasoning used by lawyers and a form of presentation known as IRAC, an acronym referring to a paragraph structure that moves from Issue, to Rule, to Application, to Conclusion.

Finally we could have a course in Advanced Investigative Writing, a course that would emphasize the truth of the writing to reality. Research and investigation would be stressed, including accurate observation, methods of interviewing, ways of gathering data via questionnaires, using the library, validity in inference, etc. From the other direction, the ways that language can distort or conceal reality would be studied, but in this case such linguistic distortion becomes a defect-- even if likely to appeal to an audience. Journalistic accuracy, including perhaps comparisons among different accounts of the same news event, would certainly be relevant. Judging the quality of the student writing in such a course would be a practical difficulty, though the abstract standard of judgment is clear. Specialists in content areas might be asked to rate the papers for reliability.

Such theorizing highlights one problem with almost all composition courses, especially advanced ones: there is now far too much relevant, even crucial, material to cover. Hence, given the present status of composition in the advanced curriculum, selection is necessary. But often the selection is erratic as we choose key notions from several approaches and mix them together.

Few universities have the freedom or the resources to allow such curricular diversity in practice. If they did, the English major would probably be in the unenviable position of having to take four or five advanced composition courses. The same friend who pointed out to me that these four discourse theories could have curricular implications is one of the new breed of English teachers who actually consider themselves primarily as composition teachers; he sees nothing bizarre in the suggestions made above. He says, "We now expect the English major to know English literature, American literature, literary genres, literary theory, as well as specialized material such as Shakespeare. And we expect such a major to take a variety of advanced courses in order to gain this knowledge. Why shouldn't we demand from our students equal breadth in composition?"

The second, and more realistic, way to make use of this four-part model of discourse theory in advanced composition is to attempt to present and make use of all four perspectives within the same course. Here instead of making the advanced course more specialized, we make it more broadly synthetic. At this level students should be ready to integrate information into a coherent and comprehensive picture, and seeing composition from these four perspectives can provide such a synthesis.

Again the course could be built in several ways. In addition to presenting the theories explicitly, one could devote sections of the course to different discourse theories. Within each unit the writing would be evaluated primarily from the perspective of that unit. And each assignment would include specifications of characteristics the paper would need in order to be rated successful, a pedagogical application of primary trait scoring. Each student would thus experience each approach to composition and evaluation, perhaps even writing on the same topic from several perspectives. Alternately, after the theories are explained, on a given assignment the students might choose from which perspective they want to approach the writing. This would be a more explicit version of what we sometimes claim to do-- judge the text in terms of its own purpose as far as it can be determined.

Especially in the cases in which advanced composition students are English majors who are likely soon to be teaching in the public schools, it is terribly important that they be introduced to this rounded view of composition-- for they are likely to assume that composition is (and will be for their students) whatever their previous courses' biases have been, usually a combination of formal correctness and exposition for an artificial audience. Real writing is much broader than that, and classroom approaches to writing, especially at the advanced level, need to be also. Future public school teachers need as wide a variety of approaches, holdings in a bag of tricks as it were, as possible. Approaching composition through these four theories of discourse could help to broaden perspective, and put some of the less common tricks into the bag.

A practical problem for any teacher interested in such a synthetic approach is that almost every textbook has its own theoretical orientation to what good writing "really" is. For general studies composition we choose texts from the utilitarian perspective by trying to decide which approach is best for the greatest number of our students. So one school uses a Macrorie-Elbow-Stewart approach emphasizing self-discovery and self-expression. Another assumes form is most important for most college students (especially when the cry is back to basics) and chooses a solid handbook. Another, assuming reader impact matters most, selects a classical rhetoric such as Corbett or Weaver, or a modernized version such as McCrimmon or Adelstein and Pival's *The Writing Commitment*. And still another institution assumes that learning to think well about reality is most crucial and chooses either a thematic reader with provocative essays (one used to be called *Contemporary Controversy*, another *The Sense of the Seventies*) or a text emphasizing effective thinking such as Moss's *Composing by Logic*, or Kytle's *Clear Thinking for Composition*. In fact a recent survey of advanced composition courses by Mike Hogan indicates that just such a diversity of texts as those listed is also used in advanced composition courses across the country.

As far as I know, no text presents a full spectrum of these theories. Kinneavy's valuable *Theory of Discourse* asserts the existence of four types of writing, each

based on emphasizing one element of the four, but it could never work as a writing text. So any advanced composition teachers seeking to follow my suggestions in one course would need either to create his or her own materials or to select a variety of apparently contradictory texts and hope somehow to mix olives with strawberries in a way that works.

A third application: at the very least the model of four theories of discourse can help us clarify and be consistent about what we are doing even within current curricular outlines especially about evaluation. One of the model's most important implications is that it can help us recognize our philosophical biases in evaluating prose. At any level it is unfair to lead students to think their writing will be judged from one perspective when in fact the teacher, consciously or not, has a predisposition that good writing is really writing which suits another discourse theory.

I recall a friend recently given her first advanced composition course. Like most of our sections, it consisted primarily of English majors, the majority planning to teach at either secondary or college levels. She began by asking that they seriously probe their past experiences with composition classes and write a thoughtful essay on what they had learned and how they had been treated. Upon receiving the papers, she was shocked: "These students aren't ready for advanced composition. They can't write decent sentences yet!" Such a comment reveals a world of assumptions about what is important to good prose. It especially reveals a theoretical conflict on the teacher's part. My friend's classroom behavior had implied that what was to be "advanced" on this assignment was the depth of insight shown in the writing, normally a component of an expressive value theory. But she had assumed-- without apparently making it known-- that an "advanced" command of sentences was also requisite. That is, she actually had in mind as a basic criterion of good writing that her students would write well-formed ("decent") sentences. In her grading, this formalist perspective dominated. Small wonder that honors students broke into tears of frustration when their papers were returned with D's and F's. This probably could have been avoided had the teacher first thought out her own criteria for evaluation and then followed the suggestion made above that writing assignments include the standards of judgment to be applied. In advanced composition as in all composition, theoretical clarity and consistency is of the utmost practical importance-- and too often lacking.

I do not want to imply that I think I have solved in my own teaching the problems raised here. They will present a real challenge the next time I teach advanced composition for our majors. At this point I know only that, as a result of having pondered the four-part theory of discourse outlined above, I will not be able in the future to teach composition as I have in the past.

East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

The Subject is Writing

Richard Gebhardt

The claim that "the subject is writing" probably prompts a bored, "So, what's new?" from serious writing teachers reading *Journal of Advanced Composition*. For you know that a writing class is not an excuse to study Navaho folkways or to train vest-pocket literary critics, any more than it is an invitation to unremitting workbook drill on usage and mechanics. You know that the subject of a writing course is writing-- that, in Mina Shaughnessy's words, "the composition course should be the place where the writer not only writes but experiences in a conscious, orderly way the stages of the composing process itself."[1]

You know, too, that people write about things-- they write articles *about* politics or novels *about* the perfect crime or texts *about* how to write well-- but that they do not write about nothing (unless they are Existentialists, of course). Without a "subject" in this sense, crucial rhetorical tensions of writer/subject/audience go slack, and the productive pressure of purpose falls so that writing may not take place at all. As Donald M. Murray puts it in "Write Before Writing," the first two forces that lead people to write are "increasing information about the subject" and "increasing concern for the subject":

> Once a writer decides on a subject or accepts an assignment, information about the subject seems to attach itself to the writer.... The writer becomes a magnet for specific details, insights, anecdotes, statistics, connecting thoughts, references.
>
> ...The more a writer knows about the subject, the more the writer begins to feel about the subject. The writer cares that the subject be ordered and shared.[2]

In itself, Murray's interesting observation only suggests that there must be *a* subject for writing to take place. But another dimension of what I mean by "subject" in my title comes into play here. What one writes about, one tends to learn. "Writing is, after all, a learning tool," Mina Shaughnessy wrote. "It captures ideas before they are lost in the hubbub of discourse; it encourages precision; it requires... that the writer make judgments about what is essential; and finally, it lodges information at deeper levels of memory than can be reached by more passive modes of learning" (p. 88). Writing is, then, as Janet Emig has said, "a unique mode of learning."[3] And this fact turns whatever we ask students to write about into sort of a "subject" they learn in a submerged curriculum in our classes.

A glance at your shelves of examination copies would show that the freshman writing enterprise has advocates for just about every subject--from anthropology to values clarification, from autobiography to career studies, from literary analysis to non-print composition. And why not? Freshman writing is a course intended to help inexperienced writers communicate more effectively, and if emphasizing a subject of personal interest to students can promote greater interest in writing, then that subject probably is appropriate.[4] But the goal of advanced composition is to push beyond minimal effectiveness so that students make real gains in strategy, style, and substance.

With that end in view, I believe it makes sense for advanced composition classes to place writing itself in the submerged curriculum *about* which students

learn while they are learning *how* to write. Then, too, many students who register for advanced writing courses have personal or career goals--high school teaching, college professoring, journalism, writing the Great American Novel--that make it quite desirable for the process or teaching or professional practice of writing to be a "subject" they study while they are striving to strengthen and refine their writing abilities.

I first sensed this fact when I began to develop the undergraduate Teaching of Writing course I described several years ago in *College Composition and Communication*.[3] In the course, I wanted to stress (among other things) the need for actual writing in composition classes, the importance of audience and the usefulness of having students write for their peers, the fact that writing is a dynamic process, the importance of positive instruction by teachers who themselves are writers, and the value of helping students become their own teachers and editors. Such ideas, I thought, should not be presented as abstract subjects removed from the act of writing. And so, as I wrote in 1977, readings, guest lectures, and class discussions about the ideas in the Teaching of Writing course "cannot be allowed to become ends in themselves."

> They are grist for the writers' mills; they are substance for papers. To guarantee that students think of their reading as a prelude to writing, I ask them to maintain a looseleaf notebook with sections for "Writing Tips," "Teaching Tips," and "Reactions." I also ask students to write papers... that require them to develop their own perspectives on ideas contained in the readings. (140)

I have mentioned the Teaching of Writing course because it illustrates how a substantial topic connected with writing can be a "subject" students learn during advanced composition courses, and because information about how to teach writing is valuable to many of the undergraduates who take advanced classes. Such information is, of course, of immediate use to prospective high school English teachers, to graduate school bound majors needing teaching assistantships to underwrite their studies in literature or creative writing, and to future elementary language arts teachers. And as teaching jobs decline and the public grumbles about "the basics," the Teaching of Writing course will become increasingly valuable to future teachers in any field that uses essay tests, library papers, book reports, or the writing of business letters.

There is another clientele of advanced composition classes that can profit from studying the "subject" of writing--would-be professional writers who, throughout their careers, will confront rhetorical choices, stylistic challenges, and daily frustrations in front of their typewriters. But the distorted ideas commonly held about the writing process are very poor resources on which to rely while facing these choices, challenges, and frustrations. Witness, for example, the publishing professor who confessed to Donald Murray that "he had been ashamed of the way he wrote, that he didn't know what to say or how to say it when he sat down to write. He had to write and write and write to find out what he had to say. He was embarassed and didn't want his colleagues to know how dumb he was."[4] That kind of misunderstanding about writing, of course, is quite prevalent. And an advanced writing course with the composing process as its "subject" can be very valuable to undergraduates who hope to live off their pens and typewriters.

Such a course could require students to write summaries, analyses, reviews,

and comparative studies of various journals, prefaces, interviews, and other such *direct testimony of practicing writers*. Among the readings that could be assigned are *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*, *Writer to Writer: Readings on the Craft of Writing*, *Conrad's Prefaces*, Virginia Woolf's *A Writer's Diary*, John O'Hara's *An Artist Is His Own Fault*, Doris Lessing's *A Small Personal Voice*, Anais Nin's *The Novel of the Future*, Barrett Mandel's "Losing One's Mind" (*CCC*, Dec. 1978), and "Sartre at Seventy: An Interview" (*New York Review of Books*, 7 Aug. 1975). The course also could require students to read and write about several recent *studies of the composing process*: works such as "The Process of Writing" in *The Development of Writing Abilities, 11-18*; Janet Emig's "Hand, Eye, and Brain," Phillip Lopate's "Helping Young Children Start to Write," and Gabriel Della-Piana's "Revision Processes in Writing Poetry" in *Research on Composing: Points of Departure*; Ann Berthoff's "Tolstoy, Vygotsky, and the Making of Meaning" (*CCC*, Oct. 1978); and studies by Nancy Sommers, Donald Murray, and Janet Emig cited earlier in this article. For variety within the course, students could read *The Counterfeiters*, *Orlando*, *Green Hills of Africa*, *The Floating Opera*, *The World According to Garp*, or another *novel that uses the act of writing as part of its subject matter*.

No doubt, some of the prospective professional writers in our classes would chafe at the academic or theoretical nature of the sort of course I just described. So, while I agree with Nancy Evans and Judith Appelbaum that "tips on technique and on industry mores, and gimmicks and shortcuts and nuggets of knowledge can be no more than peripheral aids" to would-be professional writers,[7] it makes sense to give the advanced composition course for prospective writers some degree of focus on professional work habits, strategies of submitting articles, the operation of publishing houses, and the like.

Students interested in writing fiction, for instance, could be given any number of challenging non-fiction assignments based on what R.V. Cassill calls "Reading as a Writer." Such reading requires awareness of "how the story, its language, and all its parts have been joined together," and understanding that "the story exists as it does because the author chose his form from among other possibilities."[8] Writing assignments intended to focus attention on the organic relationship of story, language, and structure would, of course, confront students with all manner of questions about rhetorical strategy, structure, and style. And students interested in writing non-fiction of fiction could profit from writing assignments based on several of the "Finger Exercises" Cassill describes in the fifth chapter of *Writing Fiction*:

> -"Practice writing short, medium, and long descriptions. Remember that the grand objective in any description is to distinguish a particular and concrete thing from all that resembles it."
>
> -"In practicing fragments of narrative... you ought to test your power to generalize and summarize an extensive action or period of time."
>
> -"Try converting a story told mostly in author's prose to one made up mostly of dramatic dialogue."(pp. 35-41)

To foster the creative search for article ideas and the discipline to research and write on various topics, the advanced composition course can encourage students to begin the "pack-rat process which involves hoarding printed materials that interest them along with scribbled notes about ideas, snatches of conversation, and nuggets of information they find provocative"-- a process Evans and

Appelbaum have found used by most professional writers (p. 12). For example, I have required students to keep an Idea File of notes, clippings, and ideas, and to write weekly Spin-Off Writings stimulated by different items in the file. Later in the term, I have asked students to select a promising Spin-Off Writing and work toward an article for a magazine they consider a likely market for the piece.

Selecting specific markets to which to submit articles is another subject for advanced courses--one that makes quite clear the complexities and significance of rhetorical choices. Students can analyze the contents and styles of various publications and prepare magazine reviews for in-class publication. They also can draw information from *Writer's Market*, *Literary Market Place*, and the guidelines for writers that many magazines mail out on request.[4]

An even more powerful assignment is the query letter, a specific inquiry about an editor's possible interest in an article or an article idea. Since a query must, briefly, clearly, and impressively, convey the substance of a project to a real and critical audience, composing several query letters to different editors can be a challenging rhetorical exercise, as well as a powerful heuristic for students to use once they are fairly well immersed in a topic. And since advice about how to write query letters is abundant in monthly issues of *The Writer* and *Writer's Digest*, and in the plethora of how-to books for aspiring authors, the assignment to write query letters can be preceded by other assignments, such as summarizing articles or evaluating the advice in different sources.

A similar type of assignment--papers based on information in various resources--is a final approach that can be taken in advanced composition courses stressing professional writing practices. Using *How to Get Happily Published* as a common text, for instance, you could assign papers on topics introduced in the book. For example:

How Good Are Mail Order Writing Courses?
What Do Readers Look for When They Read?
How Do Subsidy and Vanity Publishing Differ?
What Happens to a Manuscript after It Is Accepted?
How Can I Publish My Own Book?
Money, Taxes, and the Writer.

Since *How to Get Happily Published* includes a fifty-page annotated bibliography keyed to its main sections, students can move out from this book into challenging individual assignments from which they can learn about their future profession at the same time they are increasing their effectiveness as writers.

Findlay College
Findlay, Ohio

NOTES

1. Errors and Expectations (New York: Oxford, 1977), p. 81.
2. "Write Before Writing," College Composition and Communication, 29 (Dec. 1978), 376.
3. "Writing As a Mode of Learning," CCC, 28,(May, 1977), 122.
4. I realize the oversimplification of this sentence--sort of an academic equivalent of the Aim Toothpaste commercial that says, "If she likes the taste, maybe she'll brush longer." The key word in both sentences, of course, is *if*.

5. "Balancing Theory With Practice in the Training of Writing Teachers," CCC, 28 (May 1977), 134-140.
6. "Internal Revision," in Research on Composing, ed. Charles Cooper and Lee Odell (Urbana: NCTE, 1978), p. 87. Similar misconceptions about the writing process are clear in student attitudes and writing strategies that Nancy I. Sommers has outlined in two unpublished papers: "Revision Strategies of Student Writer and Experienced Writers," MLA, 28 Dec. 1978; and "Understanding Student Assumptions about the Composing Process," *CCCC*, 5 April 1979. These papers are being revised for future publication in College Composition and Communication and Composition and Teaching. In the meantime, Professor Sommers will send copies to interested people who write her at the English Department, 760 Van Vleet Oval, Room 113, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73069.
7. How to Get Happily Published: A Complete and Candid Guide (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 33.
8. Writing Fiction, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1975), pp. 5-6.
9. The notes on publications in Writer's Market can help you locate such guidelines. Quick, postcard requests to fifty assorted publications a month before you need them in class would net you two or three dozen sets of editor's suggestions in time for class use.

ATAC Constitution

Rita Sturm will send a copy of the proposed constitution of the ATAC to all members during the Spring of 1980. This is a very important document, not only for the legal incorporation of the ATAC, but also for defining the proper aims and goals of our organization. Please read the draft of the constitution carefully and make as many comments as you can when you return your vote to Rita Sturm, Vice President of the ATAC.

Research and Innovation in the Teaching of Advanced Composition

Michael Stugrin of the Editorial Board will provide an introduction to articles on "Research and Innovation in the Teaching of Advanced Composition" which are now called for by the editor. If your article is focused on this topic, please indicate this fact in the title of your article or attach a note to the manuscript indicating that it belongs to this category. Mail papers on this special topic to the editor.

Writing for the Pre-professional Within a Liberal Arts Curriculum

Roberta M. Palumbo

In Liberal Arts colleges during the sixties, Advanced Composition classes, often filled to capacity, primarily served English majors and students seeking teaching credentials. These courses provided students with an opportunity to practice various forms of exposition and argumentation and to develop a sense of style. Needless to say, such brisk, purposeful business wained in the seventies: now there are few English majors and only the most perservering in any discipline pursue teaching credentials.

Believing that writing instruction beyond the basics of composition is an integral part of a liberal education but realizing that students are increasingly turning to career-oriented electives which will help them secure employment upon graduation, I developed an advanced writing class that would link liberal arts education and professional training. The course is entitled "Writing for the Pre-professional."

The challenge was how to establish a curriculum that would serve the interests of a variety of liberal arts majors entering a variety of professions. My first class had students in art, music, speech, English, business, psychology, and sociology. No longer could I assume that my students were English majors intrinsically interested in language development or credential students bound by their career choice to improve their written expression.

Textbooks on technical or business writing were helpful in introducing me to the types of writing my students would use in their careers, but the assignments and examples in these books would not have been useful to them. Only a few were entering the business world and none were entering a technical field or wished to become technical writers. Opting, therefore, to use no textbook except a handbook of usage, I did select from the business and technical writing texts the types of writing I would teach my students: memos, letters, proposals, reports, and resumes. These types of writing took as their subject not business or technical information, but material relating to each student's probable career.

Through lecture-demonstrations, I or guest speakers explained the nature of each type of writing and how to go about composing each one. Copious examples from a variety of sources--my files, the Career Planning and Placement Center, other administrative offices on campus--were invaluable pedagogical tools. Every letter or memo I sent or received that semester, every proposal--informal or formal--I had on hand, every report received from the various committees of the College became part of the living textbook I was creating for my class. A letter from the Cousteau Society soliciting funds, for example, was used to discuss "audience" in writing. Or our College's report to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges was discussed in terms of how a large body of information is divided into readable units, with appropriate subheadings and effective formating.

Initially, after hearing our Career Planning Director speak about employment opportunities for liberal arts majors, each student discussed in a written statement the field of work he/she would like to enter after graduation. An art major in my class, for example, was interested in public relations/publications.

The two major writing assignments, the report and the project, dealt directly with each student's career choice.

The ten to twenty page report was an investigation of various aspects of each student's chosen career, researched through interviews with professors on campus and professionals in the field, readings from library sources, and on-site observations of people functioning in the career role. Students were encouraged to gather information from a variety of sources, divide the material under appropriate subheadings, and organize the sections into an interesting, logical sequence. Areas for them to consider included: education/training necessary, typical responsibilities/activities, competition and opportunities for advancement, salary and security, possible utilization of liberal arts knowledge/skills, kinds of people who enter the profession, writing skills required, and advantages and disadvantages. The list was to be used as a beginning framework for their research; the actual subheadings of all the reports would differ, reflecting how each student shaped his presentation to interest and inform a particular audience: other liberal arts students who were seeking information about career opportunities. In fact, the reports were shared among the members of the class, thus broadening each member's understanding of the world of work.

The project, in turn, was related to the research done for the report. Students determined what writing skills and/or particular kinds of writing were necessary for their career choice and fashioned a writing project that would help them develop this expertise. The art student, for example, decided to do three feature stories about different aspects of our college, typical of the kind of story that the public relations office of a college would develop for an Alum News Letter. Someone in psychology who was interested in gerontology did a number of patient profiles from his observations in the receiving ward of a county medical facility for senior citizens, practicing the kind of clinical description and analysis done by human services personnel. The finished project, therefore, was a portfolio of writing which exemplified the student's mastery of certain writing skills necessary to his/her chosen career.

All other writing for the course related to these two major writing assignments. Memos, addressed to me (their supervisor, so to speak), evaluted the progress they were making in their major report, citing specific people and references they were consulting in gathering their information. The resume was compiled to be used for a specific job application in their chosen career. Letters were written to be sent to professors on campus and professionals in their chosen field, requesting information, setting up interviews and visitations, asking advice, thanking for services rendered, etc. The proposal, outlining in detail their plans for the project, was written for me and had to receive my approval before they went ahead with their project.

Even though the subject of this Advanced Composition course has changed since the boom years of the sixties, its goal remains the same: teaching students how to write clear, coherent, stylistically effective prose. One thing, however, has changed--and in terms of pedagogy, definitely for the better: the students have a specific purpose and audience for every piece of writing they create. They constantly perceive, therefore, the intricate relationship of ends and means in written discourse and practice the art of uniting the two. To emphasize this principle, I dedicated a great deal of time during the semester to class analysis of the students' writing. This kind of feedback is invaluable in developing the

writing potential of each student but also underscores for them the important connection between writer and reader. Certainly this firm rhetorical base to career-oriented writing instruction makes it more than technical training. In the tradition of liberal arts education, students are still asked to think analytically, evaluate diverse materials, and present ideas and information with clarity and grace.

Holy Names College
Oakland, California

Research Service for the ATAC

JAC will publish on an annual basis a research report which will be written for 1980 by Rita Sturm. This report will include (1) the year's work in advanced composition studies in the form of an annotated bibliography, and (2) "research service" items submitted by ATAC members to include recommendations, for or against, certain texts, theoretical statements as expressed in the literature of the field as well as recommendations on published research and on published pedagogical strategies. Rita Sturm needs your help in both of these matters: you should tell her about articles you have read this year which you think are particularly helpful or pernicious, AND you should tell her about articles or books written in past years which will be useful to the ATAC membership or which should be regarded with suspicion by your colleagues. Write to Rita Sturm, Vice President of the ATAC, c/o 4468 Avenida del Sol, NE, Albuquerque, NM 87110 BEFORE 1 SEPTEMBER 1980 BUT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. Give her a citation in the usual bibliographical form, and give her your annotation, too.

Advanced Composition: A Survey

Michael P. Hogan

Although advanced composition courses are offered by most colleges and universities (and even some junior/community colleges[1]), very few articles in the professional journals have been addressed to the issues of theory and pedagogy for these courses. Only in the Guidelines formulated by participants to Invitational Workshops at the 1966 and 1967 College Composition and Communication Conferences has there been a concerted effort to examine how college instructors might design and teach advanced composition courses.[2] Because these Guidelines attempt to set forth a definition for advanced composition, the only one readily available, I used them as the basis for a nation-wide survey in the 1979 spring term to determine what characterizes the teaching of advanced composition courses. The 374 teachers who returned this 21-item questionnaire represent 311 schools.[3] The results show considerable support for the Guidelines but an equal amount of disagreement.

Of the 374 respondents, 29.7 percent endorsed the Guidelines, 28.9 percent criticized one or more topics, and 41.4 percent made no response to the Guidelines portion of the survey. The 1967 Guidelines consisted of six topic entries: 1)Definition of the Course, 2)Variety and Focus, 3)Humane Emphasis, 4)Course Content, 5)Qualifications of Instructors, and 6)Modes of Instruction. I will outline (quoting where possible) each of these topics, discuss the response to them, and relate the relevant questionnaire items to each to reveal current practices in and/or attitudes toward advanced writing courses.

1. *Definition:* Advanced composition courses should be "open only to students who have at least passed the freshman course at the same college or who have demonstrated equivalent ability." Such courses "should represent substantial progress beyond the goal of the local freshman course."

This segment of the 1967 Guidelines gives a prerequisite and an alternative but not a definition. And since students progress but courses themselves cannot "represent" progress, how we distinguish advanced writing courses from freshman courses remains unsolved. Many respondents found *advanced composition* similarly a difficult rubric to respond to because so many courses fall into that category or heading. Indeed, one respondent proposed abolishing the term. For the 311 institutions represented in the survey, respondents listed 150 different types of courses under the heading of advanced composition. These courses classify generally as follows: advanced composition/exposition; intermediate composition; genre and techniques of writing; stylistics; research; argument; criticism; teaching composition, theory and practice; creative writing; journalism; technical and professional writing; and business writing.

Regarding prerequisites, several respondents stated that the simple testing out or completion of freshman composition should not qualify students for advanced composition courses. Some schools attempt to ensure qualification by requiring one of the following: freshman composition and literature, 10.2 percent; literature only, less than 1.0 percent; freshman composition and standing above the freshman year, 7.0 percent; senior college standing and instructor permission, less than 1.0 percent. Nevertheless, the majority do require only freshman

composition, 54.9 percent, or its equivalent, 2.8 percent. Only 5.7 percent have no prerequisites, accepting students with whatever writing ability they have.4

> 2. *Variety and Focus*: "In its general form the advanced course may be viewed as covering the range of the freshman course but in greater depth," with emphasis on "alternative strategies in solving writing problems" and analysis of "the reasons for choosing among verbal forms and theories of rhetoric." Specialized courses "isolate certain kinds of writing problems for intensive examination." Specific course descriptions may be determined by types of writing (forms); writing situations and content; students' goals; modes; or specific problems such as "theories of style or history of English prose style."

In distinguishing general courses from specific courses, the 1967 Workshop participants recognized that the varieties would depend upon the size of the school, its budget, and its students' needs. Limited size, however, does not preclude specialization. In the 130 schools with a population under 2500, respondents noted 20 types of specialized courses. A few respondents did note that the examples given in Guideline 2 for special problems are "irrevelant except for graduate students and their programs."

Representative responses to Guideline 2 suggest that a definition should concentrate on rhetorical matters. In support of Aristotelian rhetoric, some respondents note that we should concentrate on professional writing or writing external to the classroom, a reader-centered emphasis. Conversely, others make a plea for more emphasis on Platonic rhetorical strategies and less on Aristotelian; thus, the emphasis would be writer-centered, the conceptualization of the thought and the inherent truth of the idea being primary. One respondent vented frustration with theories of rhetoric as pedagogical tools, saying they are as difficult to use in improving writing as are systems of grammar.

The orientation and the types of assignments noted by the respondents reveal much about the focus of instruction.

A rhetorical emphasis does dominate the course orientation, 67.9 percent of the respondents checking this item. In describing what is involved in this emphasis, they broke it down into the following categories: Aristotelian/classical rhetoric (66 citations); new rhetorical theory (21); both (5); forms and structures (58); modes (33); stylistics (22); service to the professional needs of the students (17); and problem-solving (3). Only 6.1 percent of the respondents checked the subject matter item for their course orientation, describing subject matter as ideas (9), thematic issues in fiction (2), or the subject matter in the students' majors (12). Other orientations were noted by 14.4 percent of the respondents: eclectic approaches (9); process orientation (20); McCrorie's free-writing (7); workshops (11); and creative writing (7).

The predominance of certain assignments may indicate that many instructors view their advanced courses as extensions of the freshman course, but the variety indicates efforts to reach beyond its limitation. Respondents listed no fewer than 25 types:

Types	Frequency
analyses	202
personal essays	195
reports	145
research papers	145
articles	132
reviews	129

expository essays	71
argument	47
descriptive essays	43
narrative essays	37
correspondence	33
criticism	27
persuasive essays	22
evaluative essays	15
summaries	14
exploratory essays	13
journals/diaries	12
autobiographies	10
student choice	9
definitions	7
personal narratives	4
classification essays	4
interviews	4
style	3
investigative reports	1

Perhaps the types of assignments are determined in large part by the texts commonly used. The titles of the rhetorics, handbooks, and readers listed by the respondents are far too numerous to list here, but most are those one would find being used in freshman courses. Indeed, one respondent expressed dismay that texts used in freshman composition in her school are used elsewhere in advanced composition courses. Except for highly specialized courses such as business, technical, and professional writing and stylistics, few texts on the market seem to focus on the general advanced writing course. The reason for this sparsity may lie in the lack of a working definition for general writing courses beyond the freshman level. Necessarily, the majority of the instructors, in using "freshman" texts, must rely on their own resources to make the course one of "advanced" focus and status.

The respondents were asked to list their texts according to type. The five most frequently cited texts in each category are listed below in order of frequency:

Rhetorics (123 listed)
Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student (Corbett)
Style (Eastman)
Rhetoric: Discovery and Change (Young, Becker, and Pike)
Writing Well (Hall)
The New Strategy of Style (Weathers and Winchester)

Handbooks (34 listed)
Element of Style (Strunk and White)
Harbrace College Handbook
Index to English (Perrin and Ebbitt)
Random House Handbook
The Little English Handbook (Corbett)

Readers (82 listed)
The Norton Reader
Prose Models (Levin)
Reading for Rhetoric (Schrodes, Josephson, and Wilson)

Speaking of Words (McKillop and Cross)
Twenty Questions for the Writer (Berke)

Whether the English major or minor and the English education major are required to take an advanced writing course may reveal something of the focus for the course, but especially departmental attitudes. For these majors and minor, 27.6 percent of the schools do not require the course; 48.3 percent require it of the English major; 52.9 percent require it of the English education major; and 27.9 percent require it of the English minor.

The most common explanations for not requiring an advanced writing course of the English major are that the majors acquire the necessary skills in their literature courses or that the course has low prestige for the English major. But respondents also lamented the literature majors' writing skills. A few respondents gave departmental politics as the reason. Some departments view writing as a program separate from their literature programs, so they offer a writing major but do not require advanced writing courses of their English majors. Such programs are not confined to the large institution; eight respondents representing schools at all levels of enrollment mentioned having a writing major separate from their literature programs.

Respondents were asked to list the types of majors (excluding English majors) electing the course. Responses pertaining to specific courses such as technical and business writing were excluded from the following data:

Major	Frequency
Science	84
Business	78
History	53
Sociology	48
Journalism	47
Political Science	38
Pre-Law	38
Psychology	20
Art	13
Economics	13
Languages	13
Engineering	10
Religion	10
Physical Education	10

The following majors all received fewer than ten citations: home economics, mathematics, industrial arts, music, education, management, and agriculture.

3. *Humane Emphasis*: "Crafts must be mastered, but the goal is understanding how the uses of language define human beings."

Respondents clearly divided on this Guideline. Those endorsing it asked that it be stressed more heavily; those opposing it asked that it be deleted. No item on the questionnaire addressed this Guideline, though the question of whether the orientation is primarily toward rhetoric or subject matter touched on the issue. One difficulty lies in the dichotomy of goals in Guideline 3, rather than their fusion. Certainly, the crafts to be mastered and the goal of understanding how

language "defines" humans could both be addressed under the umbrella of rhetoric.

Another difficulty is the word *humane*. As one respondent noted, "*humane* should mean 'of or pertaining to the humanities,' "expressing the view of several respondents that such emphasis would not reflect their schools' technical business, legal writing and journalism courses. To this point, a responder suggested the addition of a scientific emphasis: the use of language to expres one's scientific (e.g., chemistry, biology, engineering) perception of reality. Others protested that they could be no more concerned about humane goals in this course than in any other, or that they simply have too much else to accomplish or include to make this emphasis the major goal of the course. Confused about what "humane emphasis" means, respondents found the statement vague and reflective of the times in which it was written, the 1960's.

In understanding the Guideline to mean that defining human beings through language must begin with the writer, one respondent suggested that it be modified to stress that writers use their own written language to understand themselves. Though such an emphasis may not reflect an Aristotelian view of rhetoric, it may fit in quite nicely with the Platonic emphasis on the importance of the conceptualization of ideas.

Perhaps most significantly, one respondent noted that Guidelines 3 and 4 conflict in specifying the goal for advanced writing courses.

> 4. *Course Content:* "The primary content of any advanced course is writing itself. For that reason the insights of modern studies of language, rhetoric, and psychology should be made explicit."

The apparent intent of this Guideline was to fuse writing and theory. However, some respondents criticized the Guideline as too broad and vague. They also took exception to the suggestion that modern studies of psychology could be explicitly applied to writing in such courses. But others suggested placing even more emphasis on the importance of linguistics and psycholinguisitics to writing. But warning that composition specialists should beware of pontificating on hobby horses rather than dealing with students' writing, one respondent pointed up the danger in letting side issues become the main focus of the course.

Again, one respondent made a rather strong statement for Platonic rhetoric, asserting that the course content should consist of the "formal university essay of ideas." The purpose is humanistic and liberal in the broadest sense of education. Yet another respondent suggested comgining the concern for ideas and the writing itself by emphasizing the relationship between content and style so that the stylistic techniques would emphasize and enhance the ideas.

The formulators of the 1967 Guidelines viewed the course content as deriving from two primary sources: the topics of the students' papers and the "subject" of the writing course; but except for specialized professional courses, they provided no information on what the subject of the course might be. The survey item on course objectives may provide some insight as to what that course content might be and the relative importance respondents attach to each area. Respondents checked five suggested objectives, favoring them in the following order:

Course Objective	Frequency
Develop mature writing style	325
Develop awareness of audience	297

Teach expository forms	234
Teach modes	180
Improve skill in punctuation, grammar, and mechanics	122

In space provided, respondents listed other objectives:

Course Objective	Frequency	Course Objective	Frequency
Rhetoric	25	Writing as process	5
Revision and editing	16	Writing for publication	5
Invention	11	Logic	4
Develop awareness of thought and language relationships in writing.	11	Helping students overcome fear of writing	4
Perceiving writing as the discovery of what we know.		Career writing	2
Organization	10	Developing theories of composition	1
Research techniques	7	Appreciating non-fiction prose	1
Self-discovery	7	Accumulating a portfolio of an assigned number of pages..	1
Analytical skills	6		
Sentence combining	6		

The two primary concerns of these teachers, style and audience, are both rhetorical matters.

> 5. *Qualifications of Instructors*:. The teachers of advanced composition should have the following: 1) "special qualifications both as teachers and writers"; 2) "more than ordinary success in teaching freshman composition"; 3) a liberal "academic training"; 4) professional interest in teaching writing, demonstrated by participating in professional societies; 5) "a wide range of extra-academic experience, especially in the areas of professional interest of the students."

Given as the minimum, these qualifications were intended to demonstrate that the advanced writing courses should not be taught by "departmental left-overs" but by dedicated teachers as well-trained as those staffing the literature programs. In its field test, the questionnaire had included an item on the training of the respondent for the advanced writing course. In all cases, they cited a literature background and "on-the-job" training in teaching the course. Thus, this item was dropped from the questionnaire. But in the survey, respondents did suggest emphasizing more training in language, rhetoric graduate courses in writing and composition pedagogy so that new teachers can avoid having to "rediscover the wheel" in theory and practices.

Respondents found the Guideline on instructor qualifications unrealistic. In specific criticism, respondents noted that the "emphasis on a wide range of extra-academic experience is impractical, except for teachers of vocational students. An academic career precludes this emphasis for most of us." Others questioned whether extra-academic activities would produce better teaching and complained that such a qualification would prevent them from teaching advanced writing courses. The other qualifications were not so severely criticized, but each was questioned. Respondents remarked on how little time or inclination they

have for their own writing-- teaching is a full-time job; they questioned how "more than ordinary success" in teaching freshman composition could be determined; they doubted whether participation in professional societies as a demonstration of interest in teaching writing is an adequate criterion for any teacher of composition. For an alternative to Guideline 5, one respondent defined an effective teacher as "one who stimulates students to write well-developed and well-organized and interesting papers."

If promotions indicate anything at all about qualifications, the academic ranks listed by the respondents indicate that the advanced writing courses are not taught by "departmental left-overs" as feared by the formulators of the Guidelines. The top three ranks share the advanced writing course nearly equally: Professor--26.7 percent; Associate Professor--28.0 percent; Assistant Professor--33.9 percent; instructors and graduate assistants--8.8 percent.

As for professional affiliation, fully one-third of the respondents are not members of the College Composition and Communication Conference. But lack of membership in professional societies such as the CCCC may not demonstrate a lack of professional interest so much as failure of such organizations to meet the specific needs of the instructor who teaches the general advanced writing course. In both *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* journals, over the last 16 years, only five articles specifically address advanced composition under that rubric. Of these articles, one promoted Henry James' novels as the basis for a creative writing course, one by Francis Christensen discussed the training of advanced composition teachers, and the rest addressed writing for publication as the basis for the course.

The involvement of these teachers in their advanced writing courses may be demonstrated by the number of sections they teach. For those on the quarter system, 9.0 percent of the respondents teach four sections per year, and 2.0 percent teach eight per year. On the semester system, 26.4 percent teach two sections per year; 6.9 percent one section; 8.2 percent three sections; 5.8 percent four sections; and 2.4 percent from five to eight sections.

> 6. *Modes of Instruction:* The course should have smaller sections than those in freshman composition to allow more time for reading papers and conferring with the writers. The number of assignments would depend on the course. Students' writing should receive "considerable commentary" but grade evaluation should be de-emphasized.

The general evaluation of this Guideline is that it is a statement on workload--not on modes of instruction. Specific responses concern the question of what constitutes a smaller section and whether smaller class size is relevant "because advanced composition students are more mature than freshmen" and require less shepherding. The recommendation pertaining to grade evaluation evokes strong criticism, respondents defending grades because "Students expect to be graded;" "They demand it;" "They work harder when graded;" and "Commentary alone leaves students unclear about their achievements."

In general, class size does not appear to be the crucial issue the Guideline implies it to be. The average class size is 17 students. However, ten respondents, representing institutions ranging from under 2500 to 15,000 students, noted that their class sizes range up to thirty students. Perhaps because of larger budgets and greater student demand for the courses, larger institutions are able to offer smaller classes.

The average number of assignments is 11 per semester. One respondent stated that he makes no assignments but accepts what the students voluntarily turn in, while another requires 30 assignments, noting they are short. Respondents on the quarter system reported the number of assignments ranged from a minimum of 1 to a high of 30, the average being 9 per quarter.

The survey data suggest that the actual modes of instruction are largely traditional. The primary mode of instruction is the lecture, according to 41.7 percent of the respondents. Another 34.2 percent combine lectures with individualized instruction, workshops, discussion, conferences, or peer-editing. Only 9.9 percent use individualized instruction as the primary mode; and only 9.3 percent use the workshop, discussion, conference, or seminar as the primary mode.

SUMMARY

Although one respondent lamented the displacement of rhetoric as the focus of advanced composition courses, the survey shows that "traditional" rhetoric still provides the foundation for the majority of the courses as indicated in the objectives, the assignments, and the texts used (Corbett's *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* dominated the other texts named by respondents). However, the increasing concern for invention has apparently given rise to calls for inclusion of Platonic rhetorical concerns in conceptualization of ideas.

Emphases in the courses appear to be largely traditional and, to a degree, repetitive of those things we do in freshman composition. This point is particularly evident in the predominance of the research paper assignment. A fundamental issue is whether it should play such a major role in the advanced course: are students learning skills in invention, analysis, and synthesis in writing such papers in the advanced course that they have not already acquired in the freshman course (if the research paper was taught there) and their own major courses? Obviously more research and discussion are needed to examine this issue. Nevertheless, the point about the research paper illustrates the difficulties in defining the advanced writing courses and distinguishing them from the freshman courses with regard to focus, course content, and modes of instruction.

A definition for the general courses is needed. The specialized courses such as technical writing, creative writing, business writing, and stylistics appear to be well-defined regarding subject, audience, and purpose, as shown by the texts written specifically for the students interested in these areas. But few texts give new teachers and students directions in the general advanced composition courses; some of the respondents, new to the teaching of advanced composition, asked for suggestions about what they might do in designing their courses. Perhaps without a functional definition, the texts are not forthcoming.

A second concern is the course requirement for English majors. Whether the literature major is sufficient for preparing students to write and to teach writing is a troubling question. Requiring literature majors to take a course in advanced composition was as vehemently opposed as supported by the respondents in this survey. Such polarization indicates at least the need for discussion.

Much has changed since the Guidelines were issued in 1967. Pedagogical views, goals, and practices in composition have changed. The body of theory for composition has expanded. What is surprising is that amid the great controversy and discussions about freshman composition so little has been said about ad-

vanced courses. The 1967 Guidelines provide some foundation for discussion of our goals in the advanced courses, but as the respondents to the survey have shown, they need to be revised. They should be more precise, and they should reflect current practices and the attitudes of those who teach the advanced writing courses.[5]

Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, Missouri

NOTES

1. Though the survey was intended only for four-year schools, some members of community colleges reponded because their names were mixed in with the computerized mailing list purchased from the National Council of Teachers of English.
2. "Guidelines and Directions for College Courses in Advanced Composition," College Composition and Communication, XVIII (December, 1967), 266-268.
3. For various reasons such as inappropriate recipients, some returned questionnaires were excluded from this analysis.
4. Where the percentages do not total 100, the remainder represents no response.
5. The Grants and Research Funding Committee at Southeast Missouri State University provided the funds for this survey, 1979.

ATAC Membership Grows to 200 Members in Over Forty of the States

The ATAC was formed at the 1979 meeting of CCCC and will hold its annual meeting at the CCCC conventions as an official special interest group. The principal activities of the ATAC are to organize panels on the topic of advanced composition at the CCCC meetings, to publish a journal at least twice a year, and to conduct other activities which the membership thinks are useful, necessary, and appropriate. Please join the ATAC by using the special form printed on the last page of this inaugural issue of JAC.

Review

Conjectures on (Advanced?) *Composition and Its Teaching*

Composition and Its Teaching, edited by Richard Gebhardt, reprints twenty-one articles which first appeared in *College Composition and Communication* between February 1974 and May 1979, while E. P. J. Corbett was editor. The slender paperback is published by the Ohio Council of Teachers of English Language Arts to honor Professor Corbett, who was also a member of the OCTELA executive committee during those years.

One can only applaud the appearance of such a volume, making as it does twenty-one short, significant, and stimulating articles easily and economically available. (The book can be bought from Professor Gebhardt at Findlay College for $4.95--less than a quarter per article.) It will be a valuable companion to Ohmann and Coley's *Ideas for English 101*, Graves' *Rhetoric and Composition: A Sourcebook for Teachers*, and Corbett's own older collections, done with Gary Tate, *Teaching Freshman Composition* and *Teaching High School Composition*. The articles in the new collection tend to be moderately speculative, in between the extremes of pure theory and what-do-I-do-Monday. Most offer perspectives on identifiable segments of our discipline.

The articles in the collection are not formally divided into topical groups, but Gebhardt points out that they have to an extent been perceived as such. Five articles deal with the relationship between thought and writing, including two views of the writing process. Four articles deal with rhetoric, and three with the paragraph. Others discuss basic writing, needed research, and the preparation of writing teachers. As measures of the recognized quality of the inclusions, Gebhardt points out that two of them won the Braddock Award for the best article in an NCTE publication for the year, and that seventeen were included in Larson's annual bibliography of significant articles on composition. He might have added that the list of authors constitutes nearly a Who's Who of current composition leaders: Corder, Shaughnessy, Graves, Hairston, Gorrell, D'Angelo, Odell, and Emig--not to mention prefaces by William Irmscher and Richard Larson, Corbett's predecessor and successor as editor of *CCC*.

When I asked myself what the collection offers specifically for advanced composition teachers, I was stymied by the problem addressed elsewhere in this issue: just what is the nature of advanced composition and/or advanced composition teachers? In one sense of those phrases the collection has nothing relevant to offer since none of the articles directly addresses composition courses taught on the advanced level--although several treat basic composition. As I reviewed the 225 articles that had appeared in *CCC* in the period, I realized that on this matter the collection is an accurate reflection of the entire journal--and perhaps of the profession. Between February 1974 and May 1979, few articles in *CCC* treated advanced level writing courses of any kind. And the only discussions of advanced courses other than technical writing in *CCC* for those years were in the "Staff-room Interchange" section: Don Stewart's, "An Advanced Composition Course That Works," May 1974; and Michael P. Orth's "An Advanced Composition Course Aimed at Publication," May 1976.

That approach, however, is trivial. Let me propose a distinction that seems more useful even though very general. Perhaps freshman composition may reasonably oversimplify the world of discourse in order to assist students to gain a handhold. It may be reasonable, for example, to direct freshmen to write each essay with an explicit thesis. It may be reasonable to forbid certain developmental structures to be followed. *Not* on the grounds that this is all there is to real writing, but that if students master a limited number of workable techniques, they will have made major strides toward communicating clearly and efficiently in the writing situations they are most likely to encounter.

If that is a reasonable--though selective--theory of freshman composition, then perhaps it is equally reasonable to regard advanced composition as helping students already skilled in selected utilitarian techniques to master the more varied and complex possibilities of real writing. In this case a major function--perhaps even a definitive function--of advanced composition would be to acquaint students with the extensive store of admittedly more risky rhetorical options. Now that they have control of the central paradigmatic techniques, they are to confront the sometimes bizarre realities of the amazingly amorphous universe of discourse.

The distinction I am suggesting is well illustrated in Gebhardt's collection by the two articles on the paragraph. The first, Carol Cohan's "Writing Effective Paragraphs," is a clear but very simple analysis aimed at teachers of "inexperienced writers." Concentrating on a practical approach to teaching paragraph unity, Cohan argues that, since the standard advice in textbooks is too vague, we should teach students mentally to convert topic sentences into questions, then to provide the answers. "In the beginning the teacher should simply provide the topic sentence and concentrate on helping the students develop supporting detail that is relevant in the strictest sense." That doesn't seem to go very deeply into the matter; it certainly doesn't take into account the many sophisticated studies of paragraphing (from Braddock to Christensen to Becker), but the approach might provide "inexperienced" writers with one option that if used competently would work much of the time.

On the other hand, the following article, Arthur A. Stern's "When Is a Paragraph," uses Braddock's famous study of professional writing to argue that both Christensen and Becker made untenable claims about the existence of topic sentences in real discourse in developing their analytical/pedagogical approaches. Siding with Paul Rodgers, Stern concludes that "today's paragraph is not a logical unit and we should stop telling our students it is."

Certainly nothing worth having is gained by deceiving our students and telling them that "real" paragraphs are much simpler than they in fact are. But perhaps for the inexperienced writer, it is reasonable to say, not that "this is the way most real paragraphs work," but that "if you do this consistently, you will produce competent, workable paragraphs." Once the inexperienced writer has mastered some kernal strategies that work, it may be time to have him confront the reality that there are a multitude of possible complex transformations.

The collection's two discussions of the writing process are both relevant to "advanced" composition viewed from this perspective. The writers reach (I think) opposite conclusions, but more complex (advanced?) opposites than what freshmen are usually told. The most common model of the writing process, at least to judge by textbooks, seems still to be the triad suggested by McCrimmon, based apparently on the classical divisions of invention, arrangement, and style.

McCrimmon's terms for the process (prewiting, writing, rewriting) are now standard, although some theorists prefer alternatives (prevision, drafting, revision; or creating, shaping, completing, for example). On the other hand, some courses use Ken Macrorie's simple diadic model in which one free-writes rapidly trying to tell a truth that matters, and later revises the promising pieces.

The articles on the writing process in Gebhardt's collection are, if I read them correctly, more complex analogs of these two approaches. Both emphasize the need to base pedagogy on direct examination of the habits of real writers. In "Losing One's Mind: Learning to Write and Edit," Barrett Mandel, using a diadic model, addresses "writing and editing as they exist in experience, not as they ought to or could be done according to *theories* of writing." He criticizes, based on his own experiences as a writer, the "misconception" that writing follows thinking. He argues instead that "it is the *act of writing* that produces the discoveries" (a view similar to Emig's in "Writing as a Way of Knowing," also in the collection). Editing in Mandel's view is not primarily for clarity or substantive improvement in the discourse, but to make it conform to whatever conventions the reader expects. Mandel's conclusion parallels Macrorie's though they got there by very different routes.

Don Murray, on the other hand, argues that student writers must learn to "Write Before Writing," again because that is the way real writers proceed. His point is that before "writing" (i.e. drafting) can occur, most writers need "rehearsal," which itself involves writing: "lists, outlines, titles, leads, ordered fragments." He notes, however, that some writers do their rehearsing in their heads, and calls these alternative rehearsal practices the "reflective" and "reactive" prewriting modes. He then notes that eight signals can tell writers they are ready to proceed beyond mental or physical rehearsal into the drafting stage. McCrimmon's triad is still present but in more complex, less linear, form.

Both Mandel and Murray assume that one real writing process exists--THE WAY real writers do it--almost a Platonic ideal. In distinguishing "reactive" from "reflective" rehearsal, Murray almost accepts the possible existence of alternate writing processes: writers whose "rehearsal" is primarily "reflective" may not "write before writing" at all. Mandel makes the Platonic assumption explicit: "I assume that I am no freak of nature and that what goes on for me goes on, *mutatis mutandis*, for others. I assume that others who write go through the same emotional, physical, and intellectual steps." Making such an assumption at least simplifies a writing teacher's problems, and it may be that on the non-advanced level we should teach such a kernel process to students who do not necessarily follow it by nature, arguing that it is valuable because workable. But we ought also to entertain the possibility that we are teaching *a* writing process, not necessarily *the* writing process shared *mutatis mutandis* by all writers. Then perhaps with advanced students we should emphasize that there may be no such thing as *the* writing process with fundamental similarities underlying surface idiosyncrasies. One function of the advanced course would be to help students to discover the process (or processes) that will work best in different contexts for them. That, it seems to me, would be honest and realistic, and a very advanced view--if not a pedagogically convenient one.

Given this notion of what makes an article relevant to advanced composition, several others in the collection deserve special notice. Richard Graves defines with precision three "Levels of Skill in the Composing Process," primarily relating to the sentence. He argues that combining kernel sentences is a valuable basic

activity, but that "recasting flawed sentences" and then "composing sentences based on rhetorical models" are more valuable advanced techniques. His section on revising flawed sentences proposes a six-step mental model that is both perceptive and practical. Also treating primarily the sentence level, Robert Gorrell's "Usage as Rhetoric" is an elegant and eminently sound argument against several popular myths about usage, suggesting instead that grammatical choice "like any other rhetorical choice, depends on anticipating results." We may not want to push that too strongly onto beginning writers since it complicates the writing process by forcing audience analysis and prediction onto even relatively simple choices. But surely that is the realistic position we should confront in advanced composition.

On the level of the whole discourse, Maxine Hairston offers an unusual and advanced approach to persuasion in "Carl Rogers's Alternative to Traditional Rhetoric." Using Rogers's view that the normal response to a message is not to try to understand it but to offer a counter message, Hairston proposes a rhetoric based first on a sincere attempt to understand opposing positions and to seek common ground. It is a stimulating discussion whether one agrees with it or not. Frank D'Angelo's "A Generative Rhetoric of the Essay" applies Christensen's notion of levels of coordination and subordination to complete texts, a process that D'Angelo elsewhere calls syntagmatic analysis. It is a provocative and advanced article for serious writing teachers. I have reservations about the pedagogical value of D'Angelo's complex analytical process; it seems more likely to be a useful weapon in the arsenal of the rhetorical critic concerned with an already existent text. I certainly would not teach it to freshmen writers, but it might be of value in advanced or graduate composition courses, especially those including a high proportion of prospective teachers.

Finally, the two Braddock award winners. Jim Corder's "What I Learned at School," the introductory essay of the volume, narrates a semester in which Corder wrote each of the papers he assigned his freshmen. The process forced him to face the complexity and variety hiding in freshman assignments--even for a skilled writer. The essay (which defies summary) raises a number of issues about writing and teaching, all of them relevant to composition at any level. Gebhardt's own award-winner, "Balancing Theory with Practice in the Training of Writing Teachers," outlines "four kinds of knowledge for the writing teacher," (structure and history of the language, rhetoric, theoretical frameworks, productive classroom methods), and these provide an excellent set of desiderata for the preparation of advanced as well as freshman composition instructors.

It is easy to criticize omissions from such collections, but as I reviewed the twenty-two issues of *CCC* covered, though I would personally have made a few different choices, I generally found little to complain about. I was, however, puzzled by the omission of three Braddock Award winners. Mary Hiatt's "The Feminine Style: Theory and Fact" (October 1978) probably was not included because it is more research on written products than on the composition or pedagogical processes. It seemed a rather unusual article for *CCC* in the first place. But I have not reached any satisfactory explanation of why Frank D'Angelo's "The Search for Intelligible Structure in the Teaching of Composition" (May 1976) and Glenn Matott's "In Search of a Philosophical Context for Teaching Composition" (February 1976) were omitted. Possibly both were regarded as too broad and theoretical for the collection.

In addition to its valuable insights, this volume offers a genuinely pleasant reading experience, for the articles selected are superbly clear, graceful, even elegant. These teachers write well, their own writing frequently a beautiful illustration of the position being set forth. The articles thus form a high-quality microcosm of that complex and various world of real discourse.

E.P.J. Corbett's editorial work was marked by great energy, a clear sense of purpose, and high standards--both substantive and stylistic. I have several manuscripts bearing his elaborate and helpful commentary to attest to his scrupulous attention to both stylistic and logical details. I even recall, with chagrin, once spending the better part of three days revising a three sentence passage whose imprecision in both argument and expression he had dissected with penetrating precision. *Composition and Its Teaching* is a just reflection of Corbett's leadership, an elegant and deserved tribute to the skill with which for six years he guided *College Composition and Communication*.

Reviewed by Richard Fulkerson

1981 CCCC Program

ATAC members are urged to submit proposals for panels on any and all aspects of advanced composition to Mary McGann, Department of English, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43201 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE BUT NO LATER THAN 1 JUNE 1980. As Program Director of the ATAC, Mary McGann coordinates the program proposals for the ATAC membership so that as many of the most attractive programs on the subject of advanced composition may be submitted as possible. She was very successful in her work for 1980 and she will have an additional option for 1981 because the time-slot for the ATAC meeting will be devoted to a program rather than to a business meeting. Write to Mary McGann at Ohio State as soon as possible.